

Date: Thu, 21 Jan 93 04:30:24 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #18  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 21 Jan 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    18

Today's Topics:

(none)

Further evidence that CW should no be long

How to improve my CW speed (was: Re: Further evidence that...) (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1993 17:23:37 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!emory!  
kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: (none)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan19.204917.12463@cmhcsys.cmhcsys.com> chuck@cmhcsys.cmhcsys.com  
(Chuck Stickelman) writes:

>

> My question is: Why can't the sys-op (or whomever) setup a  
>"filter" that does a Rot13 on the "obscene, indecent, or profane words"?  
>Does this count as "Encryption", making \_it\_ illegal?

Encryption is designed to obscure the meaning of a transmission.  
Rot13 does just that. So, yes, it's illegal. The FCC rules aren't  
concerned just with dirty words, they are also concerned with  
dirty \*meaning\* and \*intent\*. That's how they nailed Howard  
Stern. It's fairly easy to write a message with an obscene meaning  
without using any of the seven deadly words.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----  
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1993 16:49:49 GMT  
From: swrinde!ringer!lonestar.utsa.edu!sbooth@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Further evidence that CW should no be long  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan18.132334.12222@hemlock.cray.com> dadams@cray.com writes:  
>In article w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org, rick@ricksys.lonestar.org (Richard McCombs  
KB5SNF) writes:

>|  
>|Is not the fact that the USCG is discontinuing use of Morse Code,  
>|further indication that it is an antiquated mode that no one should be  
>|required to learn it, at least 5 wpm should be enough?  
>|  
>|As I practice CW I find it's not so hard but, unless I fall in love  
>|with it I probably won't ever use it. If it takes me 30 minutes a day,  
>|at least 5 days a week, for 4 weeks or more to get from 5 wpm to 13  
>|could not this time be used for something better (not that wouldn't  
>|waste the time)?  
>|  
>|I'll listen to and (or) read any argument except, "You have to do it  
>|because I had to," or "What if your in a plane that crashes and the  
>|mike is broke and you can only communicate by touching two wires  
>|together."  
>|  
>  
>Well now, isn't it true that milliwatt for milliwatt, CW will provide the  
>DX user with the ability to get out to much greater distances than any other  
>form of modulation?

But remember that many people get involved with ham radio because the idea  
of TALKING to someone on the radio is what interests them  
-keyword is talking, not tapping morse code.

:~)

I've often wondered if code inadvertently acts as a deterrent to potential hams-  
I know personally that I was almost turned off totally to ham radio upon  
reading the rules and regs and noticed all the restrictions placed on Novices  
and Technicians-you've got to be at least a General class ham just to get on  
HF below 10 meters on modes other than CW.

Personally, the idea of learning code does sound like a lot of fun (something I'll be doing myself as soon as I can get a copy of a morse software tutor!), but I have to admit, the copy of 'Tune In the World' I bought about 3 years ago seemed to harp on code way too much, and the underlying tone of the book seemed to

On the other hand, I've listened in on the ham bands on my SW receiver, and I do agree, that CW will cut through the static that makes SSB inaudible. I don't think some people have a problem with code itself, but with the way it's promoted.

Simon (a potential ham, money permitting)

-----  
Date: 20 Jan 93 14:01:44 GMT  
From: mcsun!uknet!edcastle!spider!raft.spider.co.uk!jmorris@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: How to improve my CW speed (was: Re: Further evidence that...)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan18.223842.1907@cs.yale.edu> ewing@yale.edu (Martin Ewing) writes:

>  
>Great! Keep at it, and 13 wpm will come. (Even 20 will come; that's  
>where I seem to have plateaued out.)  
>  
Me too! I work mostly CW, (on hf, make that "exclusively"), but find that my speed has stuck at around 20 - plus or minus, depending on how good the sending is and how long I've been in front of the rig :-)

Yet I hear stations rattling away at a speed where I can hardly make out the dots, never mind read the code.

So, apart from "practice, practice, practice", what's the trick? Can any of the really hot CW operators give me any hints about getting over the 20wpm barrier?

I know I'm not alone in this: I have mentioned it to a couple of local hams, both of whom said "well, if you get an answer to that one, let me know..."

All hints and tips appreciated!

John.

--  
-John Morris-Spider Systems Ltd-031 554 9424-jmorris@spider.co.uk-GM4ANB@GB7EDN-

-----  
Date: 20 Jan 1993 21:44:51 GMT  
From: cronkite.cisco.com!dstine@ames.arpa  
Subject: How to improve my CW speed (was: Re: Further evidence that...)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan20.140144.14401@spider.co.uk> jmorris@spider.co.uk (John Morris) writes:

>In article <1993Jan18.223842.1907@cs.yale.edu> ewing@yale.edu (Martin Ewing) writes:

>>

>>Great! Keep at it, and 13 wpm will come. (Even 20 will come; that's >>where I seem to have plateaued out.)

>>

>Me too! I work mostly CW, (on hf, make that "exclusively"), but find that >my speed has stuck at around 20 - plus or minus, depending on how good the >sending is and how long I've been in front of the rig :-)

>

>Yet I hear stations rattling away at a speed where I can hardly make out >the dots, never mind read the code.

>

>So, apart from "practice, practice, practice", what's the trick? Can >any of the really hot CW operators give me any hints about getting over >the 20wpm barrier?

>

John,

As someone who once (when I was a teenager and had great gobs of time to spend on the radio) had a code speed of 45WPM, I'll offer this:

Keep at it. And keep at it. And keep at it.

Most of us hit "plateaus" in our code speed learning curve; typically they happen at about 10, 18 to 20 and 28 to 35 WPM. Breaking through each of them is a simple matter of persistence while waiting for your brain to adjust to absorbing information via CW at a higher speed.

What I found in crossing these barriers:

- from 10 to 15, I stopped hearing dots & dashes and heard whole letters
- from 25 to 30, I stopped hearing letters and started hearing sets of three and four letters
- at about 40WPM, I started "talking", that is, just sitting back and carrying on a conversation in CW. This was the point when CW became alot of fun. at 40+ WPM, plus knowing the Phillips shorthand, you can carry on a conversation at the same speed you can over 'phone. (about

120+WPM effective throughput)

- And once you're up to about 40 to 45 WPM, you will still be able to pick out fragments of 60+WPM operators.
- Once you're up in the 30 to 40 WPM range, you might find (as some high speed CW ops have) that keyers are tedious to listen to. You might want to check out changing the weighting on your keyer or try a bug. At higher speeds, most people prefer to make the dit/dah about 1:4 and the space between characters about 2 'dahs', between words about 4 dahs.

keep working CW. You'll get there. The single best place to hone CW skills is the low end of 40 meters. 20 is pretty good, but the contacts tend to be too short and very DX-oriented. from 7010 to 7030, you'll hear people regularly jam along at 40 to 60WPM for hours in the evening.

dsa

-----  
Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1993 02:39:40 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!yale.edu!cs.yale.edu!  
ewing@ames.arpa  
Subject: How to improve my CW speed (was: Re: Further evidence that...)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

: In article <1993Jan20.140144.14401@spider.co.uk> jmorris@spider.co.uk (John  
Morris) writes:  
: >In article <1993Jan18.223842.1907@cs.yale.edu> ewing@yale.edu (Martin Ewing)  
writes:  
: >>  
: >>Great! Keep at it, and 13 wpm will come. (Even 20 will come; that's  
: >>where I seem to have plateaued out.)  
: >>  
: >Me too! I work mostly CW, (on hf, make that "exclusively"), but find that  
: >my speed has stuck at around 20 - plus or minus, depending on how good the  
: >sending is and how long I've been in front of the rig :-)  
:  
There's one reason - on second thought - why I've never gone much over  
20 wpm. There's no extra-extra license to shoot for. We need a little  
more incentive licensing maybe? [start of long flame thread!]  
73)

--  
Martin Ewing AA6E               ewing-martin@yale.edu (ewing@yalevm.bitnet)  
Yale University Science & Engineering Computing Facility 203-432-4243

Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1993 02:39:40 GMT  
From: news!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!yale.edu!  
cs.yale.edu!ewing@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: How to improve my CW speed (was: Re: Further evidence that...)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

: In article <1993Jan20.140144.14401@spider.co.uk> jmorris@spider.co.uk (John  
Morris) writes:

: >In article <1993Jan18.223842.1907@cs.yale.edu> ewing@yale.edu (Martin Ewing)  
writes:

: >>

: >>Great! Keep at it, and 13 wpm will come. (Even 20 will come; that's

: >>where I seem to have plateaued out.)

: >>

: >Me too! I work mostly CW, (on hf, make that "exclusively"), but find that  
: >my speed has stuck at around 20 - plus or minus, depending on how good the  
: >sending is and how long I've been in front of the rig :-)

:

There's one reason - on second thought - why I've never gone much over  
20 wpm. There's no extra-extra license to shoot for. We need a little  
more incentive licensing maybe? [start of long flame thread!]

73)

--

Martin Ewing AA6E               ewing-martin@yale.edu (ewing@yalevm.bitnet)  
Yale University Science & Engineering Computing Facility 203-432-4243

-----  
  
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1993 15:19:50 GMT  
From: yuma!gw214790@purdue.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3075@uswnvg.uswnvg.com>, <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp>,  
<8486@lib.tmc.edu>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <8486@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp> bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:

>>I have acquaintances in the FCC (DC Legal Staff) that tell me there

>>are several in the agency at the central and field levels that want

>>closed repeaters to be disallowed on the ham bands.

>1) Doing this will destroy any last vestiges of experimentation in the amateur  
>service. Many experimental repeaters are closed for a good reason: the  
>uninitiated can do damage to the machine if they don't do things right. Others  
>are closed because they're linked from here to forever and having the whole  
>ham world in each city in between on them would quickly make them completely  
>unusable.

If someone can do damage to a repeater by using it, you have more experimenting to do.

We have the Colo Connection, a totally open network spanning the whole state. It is allways usable for courteous amateurs.

>You're a fucking disgrace to ham radio.

Would you use such language on the air? I think you are the disgrace, Mr Maynard.

>

>>A lot of this is commen sense, but here goes:

>

>Only to your sick mind.

>(left coast misinterpretations of FCC rules and good amateur practice deleted  
>to save space)

>I'm ashamed to have you as a licensed radio amateur. You aren't interested in  
>anything but having your way, like a 5-year-old who gets mad because he can't  
>have a cookie 5 minutes before dinner. You will do anything, legal or not, to  
>make things turn out in tune with your workers' paradise.

>

>Ham radio would be better off without you.

>--

>Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
>jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

Looks like a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Mr Maynard can't keep an open mind, and attacks the origional poster at a personal level.

Who's the five year old here?

Looks like you ascribed to malice, which made you look stupid.

Mr Maynard, it takes all kinds of people and opinions to make a world. Intolerance such as yours has no place in my world. Grow up.

Just my opinion, not that of Colo St Univ or the A.R.C.  
Galen Watts, KF0YJ

-----

Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1993 11:54:53 GMT

From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!

jreese@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8319@lib.tmc.edu>, <3075@uswnvg.uswnvg.com>,

<1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp>eese

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp> bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:  
>

>FCC insiders say closed repeater's days are numbered.

Let's see the \_real\_ official proof of this. This is all hearsay.

>If codified, the new rule would give open repeaters priority over  
>closed repeaters on the same pair. Closed repeater would be given  
>the opportunity to "open", otherwise their pair would be reallocated

Since the rules don't prohibit assigning another repeater to the pair now,  
what changes would be necessary? The FCC doesn't assign channels. It is  
done by gentlemen's agreement.

>Some buddies and I have been fighting the battle against closed, money-  
>gathering repeaters since the late 1970s. We have used litigation and  
>"jamming" as means to persuade closed repeaters to open or release their  
>pair.

Boy, this is really an effective way to impose your opinion on others...  
Has it ever occurred to you that this type of activity is one of the main  
reasons closed repeaters exist in the first place?

>...much FCC hearsay and repetition of existing rules deleted...

>

>I have long thought that closed repeater were wrong for several reasons,  
>but now it appears that they are on the way out because they do not make  
>sense on amateur bands, they do not use bandwidth efficiently, there are  
>now much better ways allocate private communication channels.

...then why don't you take your complaint to where it counts -- the local  
frequency coordinating group. Whenever the FCC is involved in petty  
disputes like the ones described above it discredits the entire amateur  
community. The FCC has more important things to do than deal with petty  
ham-politics. Surely you have better ways to spend your time.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT  
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com

| "Real Texans never refer to trouble  
| as deep doo-doo" --Molly Ivins

-----  
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 93 15:06:17 GMT



From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3075@uswnvg.uswnvg.com>, <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp>,  
<8486@lib.tmc.edu>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <8486@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:  
>In article <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp> bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:  
>>I have acquaintances in the FCC (DC Legal Staff) that tell me there  
>>are several in the agency at the central and field levels that want  
>>closed repeaters to be disallowed on the ham bands.  
>>They said they have been getting increasing complaints about  
>>the number of closed repeaters (2m, 440) in larger cities.  
>>They also feel that many frequency coordinators are not doing a  
>>good job of managing the ratio of open to closed repeaters.  
>  
>1) Doing this will destroy any last vestiges of experimentation in the amateur  
>service. Many experimental repeaters are closed for a good reason: the  
>uninitiated can do damage to the machine if they don't do things right.

As I and others have pointed out, the answer to that "problem" is to have a secure enough access to avoid that problem. I don't think the statement that the "FCC may disallow closed repeaters" means that you need to have all repeaters accessed by only using carrier detection. The point made in the statement would be that where a "closed" system exists, there would also then be the possibility of having an open repeater in the same (or nearby area). Odds are that open repeater would simply use a different access process (PL, CTCSS, etc.) than the closed system to avoid interference problems. If that were the case, your claim that all experimentation would come to an end doesn't seem to be valid. Also, I presume you meant to say the last vestiges of "repeater" experimentation as I believe there are lots of folks "experimenting" with things other than repeaters.

> Others  
>are closed because they're linked from here to forever and having the whole  
>ham world in each city in between on them would quickly make them completely  
>unusable.

But I really wonder about the value of these extensively linked systems which ultimately come down to being little more than a large "Private network" usable only by those that are part of the in group. As before, the concept of the amateur frequencies being a public resource available to all hams comes immediately to mind.

>2) As things stand, frequency coordinators \*CANNOT\* "manage" the ratio of

>open to closed repeaters; trying to do so will simply result in massive  
>lawsuits.

And if the FCC does change the FEDERAL law (applicable Part 97), just  
who is going to sue whom over what. If the FCC changes part 97,  
surely you don't expect any repeater owner to prevail in a local court where  
the coordinator is just applying the FCC regs as proscribed? Just  
what do you even mean when you say "massive" lawsuits? I'm simply  
tired of seeing that threat tossed out as if it is supported by  
existing case law, etc. I've yet to see anyone post an example of  
a coordinator being sued which might have resulted in anything more  
than the frequency assignment issue being changed, etc. No one has  
yet to post any example of a financial penalty (monetary damages)  
ever being assessed against a coordinator.

> \*NOBODY\* in this discussion has yet offered a solution to this  
>problem. If the FCC wants frequency coordinators to make value judgments of  
>this sort, it should recognize individual coordinators officially, and give  
>them explicit authority to assign frequencies to individual stations. Without  
>these provisions, coordinators are powerless to do what you want.

Then why would anyone ever sue a coordinator. You clearly point out  
that coordinators do NOT have any power to assign frequencies on any  
type of exclusive basis.

Just my thoughts on this continuing discussion.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----  
Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)  
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70  
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com  
-----

Date: 20 Jan 1993 19:18:26 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp>, <8486@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<Jan20.151950.13613@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>1  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <Jan20.151950.13613@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>  
gw214790@LANCE.ColoState.Edu (Galen Watts) writes:  
>If someone can do damage to a repeater by using it, you have more experimenting  
>to do.

You're operating from a limited view of what experimentation on repeaters can be.

>We have the Colo Connection, a totally open network spanning the whole state.  
>It is always usable for courteous amateurs.

Congratulations. How usable would it be if half the hams in Colorado were to decide to use it? What do you do if someone doesn't fit your definition of "courteous"?

>>You're a fucking disgrace to ham radio.  
>Would you use such language on the air? I think you are the disgrace,  
>Mr Maynard.

No, I would not; not only is it prohibited by FCC regulations, unlike the case of this medium, but also I would not want someone tuning around randomly to hear it. This forum is different: it was created specifically for discussions about policies relating to amateur radio (I should know, as I wrote the proposal), with the understanding that such discussions get acrimonious at times. Usenet also has different traditions from ham radio, free and unfettered expression being high on the list.

That said, I still believe that Mr. Bly is a fucking disgrace to ham radio. No other words would carry the full weight of my opinion.

>Looks like a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Mr Maynard can't  
>keep an open mind, and attacks the original poster at a personal level.

If you think that "keeping an open mind" includes acceptance of jamming as a legitimate means of effecting change in ham radio, then you're damned right I don't have an open mind.

>Who's the five year old here?

First you deride me for making personal attacks, then you indulge in one...

"Hi, Mr. Kettle. I'm Mr. Pot. You're black."

>Looks like you ascribed to malice, which made you look stupid.

I have little choice but to ascribe to malice. An admitted record of jamming and frivolous lawsuits stretching well beyond a decade is ample evidence.

>Mr Maynard, it takes all kinds of people and opinions to make a world.  
>Intolerance such as yours has no place in my world. Grow up.

I will not, and IMAO ham radio cannot, tolerate the idea that jamming is a legitimate means of effecting change.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I don't want to read poor Microsoft bashing. I want to read good  
Microsoft bashing." -- Douglas A. Bell, in comp.os.os2.advocacy (Me too!)

-----

Date: 20 Jan 93 23:47:28 GMT

From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!hpsc.it.sc.hp.com!hpuerca.atl.hp.com!

jab@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3075@uswnvg.uswnvg.com>, <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp>,  
<8486@lib.tmc.edu>

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In <8486@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

Stuff deleted....

>1) Doing this will destroy any last vestiges of experimentation in the amateur  
>service. Many experimental repeaters are closed for a good reason: the  
>uninitiated can do damage to the machine if they don't do things right. Others  
>are closed because they're linked from here to forever and having the whole  
>ham world in each city in between on them would quickly make them completely  
>unusable.

How does linking required closed repeaters? I know for a fact you can  
have extensive multi repeater linked systems with open machines.  
(We do it here in GA, I have used others in New England, Seattle, etc)

The local linked repeaters consider linking the same as autopatches,  
restricted to club members. Anyone can use a repeater to communicate.  
But linking, DVR, patches, etc are club restricted functions. This is  
legal, and what the FCC seems to intend by the regs.

You control the rpttr output. If you want the non-club member using the  
repeater on the remote end to go away when you enable your link, then do  
it. You are not interfering with his transmission. \*You\*, the repeater  
operator determine which receiver gets repeated.

I am tired of hearing technical reasons as the justification for  
closed repeaters. If the local non-technoids I work with can build and  
maintain a system that strikes a good balance, surely you guys can.

>You apparently want to force such systems as the Cactus Intertie to become  
>fully open. I have a prediction for you: it'll shut down first. All told, that

>will free up 10 channels in California, out of a total of 198. Big deal.

Where did he say "fully". Only the local repeater need be open. You want to play ancilliary functions, you pay the dues. Nope, I just see more word twisting.

The repeater operator makes the decision whether to repeat the signal on his input frequency. If he elects to not repeat that signal, he has effectively "vacated" the frequency for that duration. So turn off your repeater, take your toys home, whatever. That is your decision.

If it shuts down, other repeaters will spring up. I have no doubt of that.

I have watched a local group build a voting, multi site linked, multi remote base system of 10 rpters with multi state coverage using more or less off the shelf hardware. (GE radios, and several specific controllers.)

It remains open, and is *\*very\** usable. Never had a user blow up a radio or damage the system due to a user command. (Guess they have *\*good\** software.)

>There's another possibility: if this is adopted, the formerly closed repeaters  
>will simply make nonmembers extremely unwelcome in the hope that they'll go  
>elsewhere; maybe not formally closed, but effectively so. This is less in the  
>amateur spirit than simply closing the machine.

Not so... Several local autopatch only machines have 15 second timeout timers unless being used for a patch. They are not closed, can be used for emergencies and calling, etc. But they accomplish what they want.

I will never set up such a machine, but this *\*is\** more in the amateur spirit than "I'm sorry OM, you are not in the club callbook, could you please use another repeater" (heard recently on CACTUS).

As far as I am concerned, you can use whatever security you want to restrict the machine. But understand you have vacated the frequency when you elect not to repeat my signal...

Jamming diatribe deleted....

We have always dealt quietly with jammers. It never took more than a week. Most were kids. Three were lids. All stopped without the FCC getting involved. (The evidence/witnesses were that obvious.)

>(left coast misinterpretations of FCC rules and good amateur practice deleted  
>to save space)

And you are the judge to correctly interpret the regs??? Sounds like organized religion to me. Everyone thinks he is the one with the correct

understanding.

JV flames deleted....

I still do not see what the big deal is. Go build something exciting, like a trunked radio system, or spread spectrum, etc.

Does anyone \*really\* care about FM rpters that much? They are a tool, not a lifestyle.

The commercial world has dealt with this issue for 20 years or more. we are that far behind. Is this something to be proud of?

I watch repeater egos with their talking boxes, and packet systems with 1200/2400 connections fight over things like this, and wonder where amateur radio lost it.

Time to do something productive.

73

Alan Barrow	km4ba	I've seen things you people wouldn't believe. Attack
jab@atl.hp.com		ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion. I watched
		C-beams glitter in the dark near the Tannhauser gate.
...!gatech!kd4nc!		All those moments will be lost in time -
km4ba!alan		like tears in rain. Time to die.
		Roy Batty

-----  
Date: 20 Jan 93 23:49:12 GMT

From: gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!neoucom.edu!wtm@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <86PDXB1w165w@tosspot.sv.com>,  
<930116.121247.9h2.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,  
<1993Jan18.081622.2459@ccsvax.sfasu.edu>!  
Subject : Re: <further reasons to abolish CW requirements>

Is it not true that CW qualification requirements for radio amateurs in the US arise in part from international agreements to which the US is a signatory?

I'm an O.F. I managed to pass CW; so just about anyone ought to be able...? I agree that in lieu of CW proficiency, that passing a tougher technical exam would be a resonable alternative. I don't feel that the current tiered license system is elitist. It seems resonable to set aside some spectrum space for more technically advanced operators to carry out more experimental operation without

bothering people more interested in rag chew conversations.

What seems silly is that I have to be able to transmit 20 WPM CW to be able to be a control operator of a space transmitting station.

73,  
Bill

--

Bill Mayhew        NEOUCOM Computer Services Department  
Rootstown, OH 44272-9995 USA    phone: 216-325-2511  
wtm@uhura.neoucom.edu (140.220.1.1)    146.580: N8WED

-----

Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1993 23:57:29 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hpuerca.atl.hp.com!  
jab@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8486@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan20.150617.3024@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,  
<8491@lib.tmc.edu>&  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In <8491@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>repeater technology. They, I suspect, would find it necessary to restrict  
>access to the experimental features in order to run meaningful experiments...  
What is the problem with that?

>much. I do, however, think that it serves a valuable purpose in understanding  
>how extensively linked terrestrial systems work; there are still problems  
>inherent in such a system that are poorly understood, at best. ("Where's that  
>grunge coming from?")

\*Critical\* research.. Yeah Sure. We were doing this in late 1970's in  
the GE shop I worked in. This is not rocket science, just clean  
engineering. (Something many hams seem incapable of)

I have a hard time getting excited about fm linked systems. We have  
several times considered a trunking approach here in Atl. We have enough  
440 repeaters give it a try. Rather than cross link all of them (which  
reduces the amount of information that can be sent).

Even this is not original, but making it appropriate for HR would take  
some engineering.

But it is more innovative than YATB (Yet Another Talking Box).

Sorry, you will have to do better than that.

```
Alan Barrow  km4ba | I've seen things you people wouldn't believe. Attack
jab@atl.hp.com    | ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion. I watched
                  | C-beams glitter in the dark near the Tannhauser gate.
...!gatech!kd4nc! | All those moments will be lost in time -
      km4ba!alan | like tears in rain. Time to die.           Roy Batty
```

-----  
Date: 20 Jan 1993 13:14:13 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8319@lib.tmc.edu>, <3075@uswnvg.uswnvg.com>,  
<1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp> bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:  
>I have acquaintances in the FCC (DC Legal Staff) that tell me there  
>are several in the agency at the central and field levels that want  
>closed repeaters to be disallowed on the ham bands.  
>They said they have been getting increasing complaints about  
>the number of closed repeaters (2m, 440) in larger cities.  
>They also feel that many frequency coordinators are not doing a  
>good job of managing the ratio of open to closed repeaters.

1) Doing this will destroy any last vestiges of experimentation in the amateur service. Many experimental repeaters are closed for a good reason: the uninitiated can do damage to the machine if they don't do things right. Others are closed because they're linked from here to forever and having the whole ham world in each city in between on them would quickly make them completely unusable.

2) As things stand, frequency coordinators *\*CANNOT\** "manage" the ratio of open to closed repeaters; trying to do so will simply result in massive lawsuits. *\*NOBODY\** in this discussion has yet offered a solution to this problem. If the FCC wants frequency coordinators to make value judgments of this sort, it should recognize individual coordinators officially, and give them explicit authority to assign frequencies to individual stations. Without these provisions, coordinators are powerless to do what you want.

>If codified, the new rule would give open repeaters priority over  
>closed repeaters on the same pair. Closed repeater would be given  
>the opportunity to "open", otherwise their pair would be reallocated



>effectively shutting them down in the event of an interference  
>dispute. I would rather have closed repeaters outlawed all together,  
>but I think this is a fair solution because it allows closed  
>repeaters in rural areas where they are not a problem and  
>effectively disallows them in larger cities where they are becoming  
>a big problem.

You apparently want to force such systems as the Cactus Intertie to become fully open. I have a prediction for you: it'll shut down first. All told, that will free up 10 channels in California, out of a total of 198. Big deal.

There's another possibility: if this is adopted, the formerly closed repeaters will simply make nonmembers extremely unwelcome in the hope that they'll go elsewhere; maybe not formally closed, but effectively so. This is less in the amateur spirit than simply closing the machine.

>Some buddies and I have been fighting the battle against closed, money-  
>gathering repeaters since the late 1970s. We have used litigation and  
>"jamming" as means to persuade closed repeaters to open or release their  
>pair.

>fwoooosh!< FLAME ON...

YOU MEAN WE'RE SUPPOSED TO ACCEPT THE WORD OF A CONFESSED JAMMER AS THE GOSPEL OF WHAT THE FCC WILL DO? GET REAL!!!

Jammers are the lowest of lowlife scum in ham radio. They consider themselves to be above the law and above good amateur practice in the pursuit of their holy cause...kinda like Islamic Jihad: the means justify the ends, and to hell with innocents who get in the way: they're martyrs to the glory of God.

You set yourself up as judge, jury, and executioner, all at the press of a PTT switch.

You're a fucking disgrace to ham radio.

>Here is some of what I have learned over the years via several  
>FCC warnings , show cause orders, phone calls, letters, etc.  
>A lot of this is common sense, but here goes:

Only to your sick mind.

(left coast misinterpretations of FCC rules and good amateur practice deleted to save space)

>I have long thought that closed repeater were wrong for several reasons,  
>but now it appears that they are on the way out because they do not make  
>sense on amateur bands, they do not use bandwidth efficiently, there are

>now much better ways allocate private communication channels.

You obviously don't know what you're talking about, and are willing to break rules, regulations, and laws to force your utopia to become reality in the face of disagreement from everyone else but your small circle of comrades.

>Roger (ka6mwt)

I'm ashamed to have you as a licensed radio amateur. You aren't interested in anything but having your way, like a 5-year-old who gets mad because he can't have a cookie 5 minutes before dinner. You will do anything, legal or not, to make things turn out in tune with your workers' paradise.

Ham radio would be better off without you.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I don't want to read poor Microsoft bashing. I want to read good  
Microsoft bashing." -- Douglas A. Bell, in comp.os.os2.advocacy (Me too!)

-----

Date: 20 Jan 1993 19:33:53 GMT

From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan19.223419.13226@btree.uucp>, <8486@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<1993Jan20.150617.3024@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <1993Jan20.150617.3024@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>As I and others have pointed out, the answer to that "problem" is to  
>have a secure enough access to avoid that problem. I don't think the  
>statement that the "FCC may disallow closed repeaters" means that  
>you need to have all repeaters accessed by only using carrier  
>detection. The point made in the statement would be that where a  
>"closed" system exists, there would also then be the possibility of  
>having an open repeater in the same (or nearby area). Odds are that  
>open repeater would simply use a different access process (PL, CTCSS,  
>etc.) than the closed system to avoid interference problems. If that  
>were the case, your claim that all experimentation would come to  
>an end doesn't seem to be valid. Also, I presume you meant to  
>say the last vestiges of "repeater" experimentation as I believe  
>there are lots of folks "experimenting" with things other than  
>repeaters.

...except that the experimental repeater co-channelled with an open repeater

would not be able to operate any significant amount under the rules under discussion, as the open repeater could force the experimental repeater off the air simply by keying up. All it would take would be for licensed radio amateur operators (note, I carefully didn't say "hams") like Mr. Bly who didn't like closed repeaters to keep the open box keyed up a significant part of the time to keep the experimental box from being useful.

Much of the outcry coming from those who say that closed repeaters should be forced off the air (or, nearly as bad, forced to rechannel to share frequencies on a close-spaced basis) is from those who wish to experiment with repeater technology. They, I suspect, would find it necessary to restrict access to the experimental features in order to run meaningful experiments...

>But I really wonder about the value of these extensively linked  
>systems which ultimately come down to being little more than a  
>large "Private network" usable only by those that are part of the  
>in group. As before, the concept of the amateur frequencies being a  
>public resource available to all hams comes immediately to mind.

I don't know if I can address this one; while the repeater I frequent is part of an extensive linked system, I don't talk to the folks in San Francisco much. I do, however, think that it serves a valuable purpose in understanding how extensively linked terrestrial systems work; there are still problems inherent in such a system that are poorly understood, at best. ("Where's that grunge coming from?")

>And if the FCC does change the FEDERAL law (applicable Part 97), just  
>who is going to sue whom over what. If the FCC changes part 97,  
>surely you don't expect any repeater owner to prevail in a local court where  
>the coordinator is just applying the FCC regs as proscribed? Just  
>what do you even mean when you say "massive" lawsuits? I'm simply  
>tired of seeing that threat tossed out as if it is supported by  
>existing case law, etc. I've yet to see anyone post an example of  
>a coordinator being sued which might have resulted in anything more  
>than the frequency assignment issue being changed, etc. No one has  
>yet to post any example of a financial penalty (monetary damages)  
>ever being assessed against a coordinator.

Who cares about prevailing in a court? Just getting to that court is expensive as hell. Ask Karl Pagel about getting sued; he wound up capitulating - and, in the process, no longer doing what some folks in this discussion have demanded, reserving pairs for future use - because he could not afford to defend himself. Yes, the law may be on the coordinators' side, though questions of due process and unfair practices may continue to be raised even if the law were to be changed as you describe; further, there's always the test case for the law, and the coordinator who gets caught up in that one will go down in financial flames merely because he was unlucky enough to be the target.

No coordinator is going to follow rules that will lead him to getting sued. I've been there, and know the risks. Have you, and do you?

>Then why would anyone ever sue a coordinator. You clearly point out  
>that coordinators do NOT have any power to assign frequencies on any  
>type of exclusive basis.

Because they didn't like the coordinator's decision. Because they think the coordinator should have given them their blessing instead of some other group on THEIR frequency.

Coordinators do not have power to assign frequencies, and to tell others to get off of them. They do have the power to say, "If you operate at this location, on this frequency, within these technical parameters, we will not tell the same to any other group which would cause you interference." That's all...but it's often enough. The system works now. Changing it will most likely break it.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I don't want to read poor Microsoft bashing. I want to read good  
Microsoft bashing." -- Douglas A. Bell, in comp.os.os2.advocacy (Me too!)

-----  
Date: 21 Jan 1993 04:47:57 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!  
tamsun.tamu.edu!willis@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930116.121247.9h2.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,  
<1993Jan18.081622.2459@ccsvax.sfasu.edu>,  
<1993Jan20.234912.3584@uhura.neoucom.edu>1  
Subject : Re: <further reasons to abolish CW requirements>

In article <1993Jan20.234912.3584@uhura.neoucom.edu> wtm@uhura.neoucom.edu (Bill Mayhew) writes:

>a tougher technical exam would be a reasonable alternative. I don't  
>feel that the current tiered license system is elitist. It seems  
>reasonable to set aside some spectrum space for more technically  
>advanced operators to carry out more experimental operation without  
>bothering people more interested in rag chew conversations.  
>

>What seems silly is that I have to be able to transmit 20 WPM CW to be  
>able to be a control operator of a space transmitting station.  
Or since only Advanced/Extras can be VE's, why higher code speed is  
a prerequisite there (other than to test higher code speed...).

IMHO, the complaint against CW is *\*not\** that it should be done away with;

many people like it & it is a useful mode. But it's (correctly) perceived as the only real barrier to getting advanced/extra class licenses, AND THESE LICENSE CLASSES HAVE EXTRA PRIVILEGES UNRELATED TO HIGHER CODE SPEED. If you want to award additional HF bandwidth to those who work & achieve 20wpm, fine. But there should be another ladder (harder than current tests) for those whose interests lie elsewhere.

-----  
Date: 21 Jan 1993 04:39:44 GMT  
From: sun-barr!cs.utexas.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!willis@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan20.150617.3024@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>, <8491@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan20.211059.8912@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <1993Jan20.211059.8912@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>  
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>It need not cost the coordinator anything more than his personal time  
>and effort. There is no requirement that the coordinator hire an attorney.  
>If it were me, I'd represent myself. What's the worst outcome, the  
>frequency(ies) at issue get coordinated in some other manner.  
No, you might be ordered to pay damages and/or court/laywer fees!

>As above, if the coordinator's decision is within the framework of whatever  
>FCC regulations apply, I fail to see why a coordinator couldn't just  
>make that argument him/herself to the judge where the case is being  
>handled. Also, it should be obvious to any court that any case  
>like that should not be argued in anything other than the appropriate  
>federal court.

"an attorney who represents himself has a fool for a client."  
I've not been involved in any ham-related litigation, but have had several friends and employees who tried the self representation route. BIG mistake... The US legal system is designed to employ lawyers and offers many pitfalls to those who naively think anything is obvious to a judge or even that being obvious matters! Once someone has filed a suit against you, even a \*stupid\* one (in your opinion), you have to expend time and money just to make it go away. Go ahead and argue about closed/open repeaters, but don't assume you can navigate the legal system without a lawyer.

Horror stories available on request, but not for the weak of stomach.

-----  
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 93 21:10:59 GMT

From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8486@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan20.150617.3024@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,  
<8491@lib.tmc.edu>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <8491@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:  
>In article <1993Jan20.150617.3024@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>  
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>>And if the FCC does change the FEDERAL law (applicable Part 97), just  
>>who is going to sue whom over what. If the FCC changes part 97,  
>>surely you don't expect any repeater owner to prevail in a local court where  
>>the coordinator is just applying the FCC regs as proscribed? Just  
>>what do you even mean when you say "massive" lawsuits? I'm simply  
>>tired of seeing that threat tossed out as if it is supported by  
>>existing case law, etc. I've yet to see anyone post an example of  
>>a coordinator being sued which might have resulted in anything more  
>>than the frequency assignment issue being changed, etc. No one has  
>>yet to post any example of a financial penalty (monetary damages)  
>>ever being assessed against a coordinator.

>

>Who cares about prevailing in a court? Just getting to that court is expensive  
>as hell. Ask Karl Pagel about getting sued; he wound up capitulating - and, in  
>the process, no longer doing what some folks in this discussion have demanded,  
>reserving pairs for future use - because he could not afford to defend  
>himself. Yes, the law may be on the coordinators' side, though questions of  
>due process and unfair practices may continue to be raised even if the law  
>were to be changed as you describe; further, there's always the test case for  
>the law, and the coordinator who gets caught up in that one will go down in  
>financial flames merely because he was unlucky enough to be the target.

It need not cost the coordinator anything more than his personal time  
and effort. There is no requirement that the coordinator hire an attorney.  
If it were me, I'd represent myself. What's the worst outcome, the  
frequency(ies) at issue get coordinated in some other manner.

You mention a lawsuit involving Karl Pagel, a few questions come  
to mind: (1) What was the issue? (2) In what court (federal, state, etc.)  
was the case decided? (3) Is the case written up anywhere to review?

>No coordinator is going to follow rules that will lead him to getting sued.  
>I've been there, and know the risks. Have you, and do you?

>

>>Then why would anyone ever sue a coordinator. You clearly point out  
>>that coordinators do NOT have any power to assign frequencies on any  
>>type of exclusive basis.

As above, if the coordinator's decision is within the framework of whatever FCC regulations apply, I fail to see why a coordinator couldn't just make that argument him/herself to the judge where the case is being handled. Also, it should be obvious to any court that any case like that should not be argued in anything other than the appropriate federal court.

>Because they didn't like the coordinator's decision. Because they think the  
>coordinator should have given them their blessing instead of some other group  
>on THEIR frequency.

>Coordinators do not have power to assign frequencies, and to tell others ot  
>get off of them. They do have the power to say, "If you operate at this  
>location, on this frequency, within these technical parameters, we will not  
>tell teh same to any other group which would cause you interference." That's  
>all...but it's often enough. The system works now. Changing it will most  
>likely break it.

Maybe changing it will, maybe not, time will ultimately tell.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----  
Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)  
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70  
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

-----  
Date: 21 Jan 1993 04:39:44 GMT  
From: munnari.oz.au!sgiblab!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!  
tamsun.tamu.edu!willis@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan20.150617.3024@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>, <8491@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<1993Jan20.211059.8912@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <1993Jan20.211059.8912@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>  
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>It need not cost the coordinator anything more than his personal time  
>and effort. There is no requirement that the coordinator hire an attorney.  
>If it were me, I'd represent myself. What's the worst outcome, the  
>frequency(ies) at issue get coordinated in some other manner.  
No, you might be ordered to pay damages and/or court/laywer fees!

>As above, if the coordinator's decision is within the framework of whatever  
>FCC regulations apply, I fail to see why a coordinator couldn't just

>make that argument him/herself to the judge where the case is being  
>handled. Also, it should be obvious to any court that any case  
>like that should not be argued in anything other than the appropriate  
>federal court.

"an attorney who represents himself has a fool for a client."  
I've not been involved in any ham-related litigation, but have had several  
friends and employees who tried the self representation route. BIG  
mistake... The US legal system is designed to employ lawyers and offers  
many pitfalls to those who naively think anything is obvious to a judge  
or even that being obvious matters! Once someone has filed a suit against  
you, even a \*stupid\* one (in your opinion), you have to expend time and money  
just to make it go away. Go ahead and argue about closed/open repeaters,  
but don't assume you can navigate the legal system without a lawyer.

Horror stories available on request, but not for the weak of stomach.

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #18

\*\*\*\*\*